

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, November 29, 1991

- Present:** C.L. Bertrand; M. Yates; B. Harris; P. Bird; C. White; C. Foster; J. Appleby; P. Widden; M. Brian; R. Pallen; C. Bolton; G. Kanaan; W. Knitter; G. Auchinachie; J. Woodsworth; W. Sellers; J. Anderson; S. Kumarapeli; G. Decarie; J. Fiset; L. Crysler; C. Lévy; P. Allen; W. Byers; A. Teffeteller; C. Gray; R. Sharma; M. Poirier; N. Segalowitz; I. Robinson; M. Ainley; S. Hoecker-Drysdale; C. Potworowski; J. Snyder; K. Beaudoin; E. Chan; K. Clément; S. Desjardins; H. Halsal; D. Haufschild; A. Leonhardt; B. Leonhardt; C. Nero; D. Parent.
- Regrets:** S. Carter; F. Stevens; M. Kusy; B. Lewis.
- Absent:** J. Lightstone; J. Gavin; M. Mendell; G. Fisher; H. McQueen; J. Locke; Newsham; M. Pruska-Carroll; J. Vidmar; J.F. Plamondon; D. Awasti; M. Innes; C. McManaman; G. Pahinis.
- Guests:** J. Drysdale; C. Maillé; P. Toone.

1. Call to Order

Dr. Bertrand called the meeting to order at 1:50 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Dr. Bertrand asked that Item 5 on the Agenda be changed to **Board of Governors Committee on Procedures for Evaluation of Search Committees**

91-10M-1 It was moved and seconded (Levy/Sharma) that the Agenda be approved as amended.

Carried.

3. **Ratification of student member for Advisory Search Committee for Dean of Arts and Science**

Dr. Bertrand reported to Council that the Board of Governors had not accepted the student representative, Mr. David Parent, as put forward by the Arts and Science Faculty Council for the Advisory Search Committee for Dean of Arts and Science. He said that Mr. Parent had initiated a lawsuit against the university and that the Board considered his serving on the Advisory Search Committee to be a potential conflict of interest. He understood that the students were again intending to put forward Mr. Parent's name and asked them to reconsider that decision. He felt they would be running the risk of having only one student representative instead of two.

Ms. Nero responded that the students had carefully considered the issue both before the original submission of Mr. Parent's name and after the decision of the Board of Governors. They felt very strongly that it was their prerogative to appoint student representatives and they felt that Mr. Parent was aptly qualified. No one likely to apply for the position of Dean was named in the suit and in the event that a conflict of interest did arise, Mr. Parent was willing to step down. Students did not like the administration being able to hand pick or reject the student candidates. They approved appointments according to a process, and Mr. Parent was approved through that process. They felt it inappropriate for the Board of Governors or any representative of the administration to attempt to influence their choice of candidate.

Dr. Bertrand said that he did not wish to have a long debate on the issue as one could argue it was inappropriate to name someone who was currently suing the university as the students' representative. However, it was Council's prerogative to ratify or not. Dr. Bertrand said that as the students did not choose to change their representative Council would vote on the ratification of Mr. Parent as a student representative on the Advisory Search Committee for a Dean of Arts and Science.

Ms. Nero said that she was unaware that Council had overturned its previous ratification of Mr. Parent as it had been recorded in Minutes that Mr. Parent was ratified as a student representative.

Dr. Bertrand reminded Ms. Nero that the Minutes had not yet been approved by Council.

Dr. Pallen explained that the Board of Governors had refused to accept Mr. Parent's nomination and had sent it back to Faculty Council because of a potential conflict. The Board of Governors had asked Council for another nomination. It seemed to him that it was up to Council to ratify the choice again by vote.

Dr. Bird asked for the vote to be held by secret ballot.

Dr. Allen said that she did not know this individual nor any of the circumstances surrounding his case and did not see how she could vote without more information.

Dr. Bertrand explained that Mr. Parent was currently suing the university. There would be a lawsuit against the university as well as against one specific individual. The legal opinion that he had was that this was a broad enough case that indeed a number of people currently in the Faculty of Arts and Science may wish to present themselves as candidates for the position of Dean and would be involved in this legal case because they had been involved in other jurisdictions where Mr. Parent had gone to Student Request Committee, Appeals, or Code of Conduct.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale asked if by the same token she broke her leg on university grounds due to negligence of upkeep and sued the university for damages, she would be deprived of any positions on committees or any participation in the university.

Dr. Bertrand said he believed that analogy would not hold. Mr. Parent was suing the university over a specific set of problems which had nothing to do with a broken leg. He suspected that if one sued the university for breaking a leg and was on a search committee for Vice Rector Services there would be a conflict, but for the Dean of Arts and Science one would probably be appointed to that committee as the Dean of Arts and Science was not responsible for the physical plant of the university.

Ms. Nero asked to see the legal opinion that the Dean mentioned and asked who had given the legal opinion. She informed Council that CUSA's lawyer perceived no conflict of interest from the guidelines provided by the Board of Governors. If the Faculty of Arts and Science had a different legal opinion she would like to see it.

Dr. Bertrand responded that he had not seen CUSA's legal opinion either.

Professor Crysler said that as a member of Faculty Council he did not think that the request to see the legal opinion was unreasonable.

Dr. Bertrand responded that the opinion had not been written down.

Dr. Widden said that we did not know enough about the issue to overturn the nomination.

Dr. Bertrand responded that in that case Dr. Widden should vote for Mr. Parent's ratification. Dr. Bertrand could not say much about the legal suit but felt there was a great deal behind it. As there was no further discussion Dr. Bertrand asked Council to vote YES for 'ratification' and NO for 'against ratification'.

Dr. Bertrand asked Dr. John Drysdale to count the ballots.

Mr. David Parent - Ratified - Vote: 14 yes; 12 no; 6 abstentions; 4 blank ballots.

4. Discussion of the Final Report of the Strategic Space Planning Committee

Dr. Bertrand said that Steering Committee wanted the debate to be divided into two stages, the discussion should begin with the rather broader question of where faculties of Concordia University should be located; and within that context what was best for Arts and Science. Then if Council came to some decision about that, and it may be that Council's decision fitted in with one of the scenarios in the document, there could be some discussion about that.

Mr. Toone raised a point of order. He said that there were more implications to this debate in that the Dean of Arts and Science was to be the next Vice Rector, Services officiating over the outcome of any decision taken by Faculty Council and therefore should not be the person to chair the present discussion.

Dr. Bertrand thanked Mr. Toone for his point of order.

Mr. Toone then challenged the Chair.

Dr. Bertrand told Mr. Toone that he had made a point of order which had been noted. However, he was Dean of Arts and Science and therefore Chair of Council.

Dr. Bertrand thought that we might work from a Committee of the Whole for 30 to 45 minutes to see which way we got out of the discussion on where the faculties of Concordia were going to be located and what was best for the Faculty of Arts and Science and out of that we might get some sense of what the exact motion could be.

Dr. Bertrand welcomed Dr. Charles Giguère who had again come to Council to help with the discussion of the Final Report of the Strategic Space Planning Committee.

Dr. Bertrand interrupted the meeting to introduce Dr. Gail Valaskakis who would

be the Acting Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science from January 1, 1992. He apologized for not having done that earlier in the meeting.

Dr. Bertrand said that he had received a request from Dr. Segalowitz for Dr. Chaikelson to have speaking privileges.

Mr. Leonhardt asked when it would be proper for the students' motions to be considered. He thought that it would be useful to do so before Council went into a Committee of the Whole.

- 91-10M-2** It was moved and seconded (B. Leonhardt/Parent) that whereas after Council's approval of the Agenda in the last meeting, the Chair unilaterally chose to divide the question of space planning into two parts, the study of principles separately from the study of scenarios, and Whereas after approval of the Agenda this was a prerogative of the Council alone requiring a motion and a vote, and Whereas it is the responsibility of the Chair to see that all members uphold the rules of the assembly which were then violated by the Chair himself, and Whereas by the overwhelming evidence repeatedly noted in the meeting itself members kept returning to the scenarios, it is clear that the Chair's choice did not reflect the will of the Council, so that planned interventions were disallowed to the dismay of most Council members, Be it resolved that the Chair be censored for this conduct and instructed to henceforth seek formal Council approval to modify the Agenda once approved by Council.

Dr. Bertrand asked for discussion on the motion. Dr. Bertrand disagreed entirely with everything said, as the Agenda did not include anything other than a discussion of the Space Plan and there was no indication on the Agenda as to how that discussion was to take place. He thought it perfectly within the prerogative of the Chair to try to facilitate the business of Council.

Failed

- 90-10M-3** It was moved and seconded (B. Leonhardt/Nero) that whereas the restoration of Principle 5 did not address all the concerns raised in the discussion about it first being dropped, be it resolved that to Principle 5 be added the following sentence: "All restructuring of schedules ought to respect the needs of the student and faculty communities, notably the need for students to work in order to pay for increasingly expensive education, and that classes not be normally scheduled on extended weekends (that is to say, not past Friday noon) nor in any tri-mester format that would pressure the average student to give up the summer jobs he and she so need."

Dr. Bertrand ruled the motion out of order since Council was not debating the Principles this afternoon. He also pointed out that he did not feel that was a Principle but rather a great deal of detail in connection with the Principle. He suggested the issue be raised at Senate where the document would be discussed.

Mr. Leonhardt challenged the Chair on his ruling.

Challenge to overturn the ruling of the Chair: Chair was Upheld

Dr. Bertrand moved Council into A Committee of the Whole to discuss the question of where faculties are to be located.

Council was moved back into regular session at 3:05 p.m.

91-10M-4 It was moved and seconded (Gray/Kumarapeli) that a disclaimer be adopted which stated that the approval of any particular scenario did not imply approval of any particular location for any specific department.

Ms. Nero asked for the intent of the motion. She could not support it if it meant consolidation, especially in scenario A. How could Council make a decision on a scenario which by its nature concentrated departments on one campus or another and attach a disclaimer to it. This seemed to be a way of scuttling any decision this Council might make.

Dr. Gray said that the intent was clear regarding Scenario A and regarding Arts and Science. The difficulty would be mostly with its application to Scenarios B and C, which explicitly spoke to one block location of one or another Faculty. This was a limiting arrangement; it would weaken the block character of such faculty location.

Ms. Nero said that it seemed to be putting the cart before the horse. She felt that Council should adopt a scenario and then introduce a disclaimer.

Dr. Decarie said that it answered the point he was getting at earlier. When a long range plan was approved, it was possible, even likely, that the plan might not be put into effect. However, whatever faculties approved could be used against them later in very interesting and unforeseeable ways. We have always been fortunate, and will continue for some years, to have a Vice Rector who would not do such a thing. However, it may have been a mistake to have approved the Principles which were so broad they could be used to justify almost anything. It was very important therefore, that limitations should be made clear before any particular scenario was approved.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale asked whether the discussion was to be limited to Scenarios A, B and C or whether the discussion was to be in open terms of scenarios, including one suggested at Council this afternoon.

Dr. Bertrand reminded Council that he had said to the Vice Rector at the end of his explanation regarding the costing of the various scenarios, a scenario that would prove to be more costly does not preclude our Council preferring that over any other.

Ms. Nero was not disinclined to agree with Professor Decarie but wondered if the mover would table the motion till the scenarios had been discussed.

Dr. Gray said that he would not consider tabling the motion; he felt that time constraints might not allow Council to get back to it.

91-10M-5 It was moved and seconded (Byers/Crysler) that the Gray/Kumarapeli motion be amended to read "... the approval of any particular scenario does not imply approval of any particular location for any specific department in the Faculty of Arts and Science".

Professor Crysler spoke in support of the motion because two or three of the scenarios specifically mentioned other departments in other faculties and he felt Council should make it clear that it was concerned about the departments in the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Professor Brian said that Scenario C mentioned departments in the Faculty of Arts and Science. She felt the amended motion should include the phrase "except in those cases where departments were already referred to in the scenarios."

91-10M-4 It was moved and seconded (Gray/Kumarapeli) that a disclaimer be approved to read: The approval of any particular scenario does not imply approval of any particular location for any specific department.

Carried.

91-10M-5 It was moved and seconded (Byers/Crysler) that the Gray/Kumarapeli motion be amended to read "... The approval of any particular scenario does not imply approval of any location for any particular department in the Faculty of Arts and Science".

Carried.

91-10M-6 It was moved and seconded (Nero/Parent) that Arts and Science Faculty support Scenario C from the Final Report of the Strategic Space Planning Committee with the following amendments in the first paragraph:

This scenario would be oriented towards the consolidation of the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science on the Loyola campus, and the Faculty of Commerce and Administration on the Sir George Williams campus, while maintaining significant and viable teaching and administrative presence on the Loyola campus. Performing Arts disciplines would remain on the Loyola campus, with more effective departmental facilities being provided, and Communication Studies, Classics, Journalism, Lonergan College, Modern Languages and Exercise Science would maintain their current status on the campus. A group of humanities or social science departments (excluding Psychology), whose students and research activities would benefit from proximity to such academic units as the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science or the Performing Arts, could be accommodated on the Loyola campus while maintaining a significant and viable teaching and administrative presence on the Sir George Williams campus. The pure sciences and the remaining humanities and social science departments could be grouped together on the Sir George Williams campus, while maintaining a significant and viable teaching and administrative presence on the Loyola campus, along with the Visual Arts disciplines.

Dr. Giguère thought that he understood Ms. Nero was trying to propose approval of Scenario C with amendments. He thought that she was trying to propose that there should be a science presence at the Loyola campus while the majority was to be concentrated downtown. He suggested that it should be phrased in that way.

Miss Halsal asked Dr. Giguère whether Ms. Nero's suggestion could be incorporated into the text.

Dr. Giguère said that the document which would go to Québec would be a several-part document which would be gone over by several professionals who were very good at writing in French. He wanted to know what the thinking was, rather than have a specific text from members of Council. He suggested that this document was not to be used as a sacred text. The ideas were the important thing.

Dr. Gray asked if the motion might be divided into two, one motion to approve the text as amended and one motion to approve Scenario C.

Dr. Bertrand said that he did not understand why Dr. Gray suggested splitting the

motion. Ms. Nero had moved that Council approve Scenario C with certain changes to the first paragraph.

Dr. Gray said that one might not think much of Scenario C, but if it was passed, it would reduce to a minimum, the disadvantageous features of it so that one could conceivably vote for modifications to Scenario C and then vote against it and not be quite as upset for defeating it.

Dr. Bertrand did not like Dr. Gray's suggestion. He felt that Ms. Nero had put forward a legitimate motion that could stand on its own.

Dr. Widden said that he had a problem with the procedure. He questioned whether in voting for the motion, we were voting for the scenario but also voting for a motion which amended the scenario. He suggested we should have a motion to approve the scenario and then an amendment to that motion, it would be a lot easier to break it down.

Ms. Nero explained that the motion was put forward in that way as the students felt it important that the text of the motion include the concept of non-consolidation. It was their feeling that by striking down Principle E, the principle of consolidation across the board had been defeated by this Council and they wanted to make clear that the principle of consolidation in E be reflected in the scenario.

Dr. Widden said that a vote against this motion would not be to vote against C.

Dr. Bertrand said that Ms. Nero's motion could be voted down and another motion could be proposed to approve Scenario C.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale said that the discussion seemed to be on Robert's Rules of Order rather than one of substance. Arts and Science Council needed to decide the future of Arts and Science. From what she gathered, other faculties decided and voted on the location of their faculties. Arts and Science should be doing the same and let its decision be integrated into whatever scenario somebody was going to decide on outside of this body. She still did not have a clear sense of how this Council saw the future of Arts and Science, in terms of its physical location in this university. It was important to focus the discussion so that we did not end up with a fluke decision on the basis of some motion which was totally unsatisfactory to everybody.

Dr. Segalowitz agreed with Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale. He was not pleased with any of the scenarios in the report. He preferred the scenario proposed by Dr. Chaikelson. He thought we should discuss each scenario in turn and why we, as Arts and Science, do not like it.

Ms. Nero said we were told quite bluntly that if we do not choose a scenario, one will be chosen for us. The students felt that consolidating Arts and Science at Loyola would be a mistake. They felt that it was important to do whatever they could to guarantee that the basic concept of a two-campus operation not be deserted. They were not trying to sneak around the issue. She felt that it would be a good idea for the Arts and Science Faculty Council to come up with a statement that said in addition to whatever scenario it chose that it absolutely abhorred these principles. Students felt that C with its amendment was best, it reflected their opposition to consolidation of the Humanities and Social Sciences at Loyola. They felt that student life should not be changed by an arbitrary decision made outside of the bodies which should make the decision. While they did not view C as "heaven on earth", they felt that Scenario C, as amended, was the best of the three.

Dr. Auchinachie said that he was in favour of Ms. Nero's motion because there was insufficient time to decide on another scenario.

Sister Prudence said that she felt Scenario C kept most of the Humanities at Sir George Williams campus and did not maintain a two-campus operation except in specific instances. There seemed to be some contradiction between that and what had been said.

Dr. Giguère agreed that she was correct in her interpretation of Scenario C, that in order to put Engineering and Computer Science at Loyola, there would have to be a reduction of the Arts and Science presence, particularly the Humanities and Social Sciences at Loyola campus.

Dr. Auchinachie indicated that he understood that Engineering had approved something which they called C' (prime) which seemed to set precedence for modifying one of these.

Dr. Segalowitz said that given the intentions of the mover, he did not understand why C was chosen over B. If the concern was about spreading Arts and Science between two campuses, it should not matter where Engineering ended up.

Ms. Nero said that the Student Caucus, after speaking to a number of people, felt that the move of Engineering to Loyola would be the least detrimental to a two-campus operation. The amendments to the scenario were specifically to guarantee that some sort of two-campus operation was maintained in spirit, in the scenario. That was why the phrase "significant and viable teaching and administrative presence" was added where a specific faculty or group of disciplines was concentrated on one campus. There seemed to be a lot of sound reasons for grouping Engineering at Loyola. CUSA tried to take into consideration what was best for all students, not just Arts and Science, and it was their opinion that

Engineering would be least damaged by a concentration at Loyola. While there would be some concentration, scenario C, in their opinion allowed a teaching and administrative presence on both campuses.

Dr. Segalowitz said that he had difficulty tying all these elements together. He wondered why the discussion was centred on what was best for Engineering students, while maintaining a two-campus operation for Arts and Science.

Ms. Nero explained that of all the scenarios dealing with consolidation, they felt this was least damaging for Arts and Science students, and a two-campus operation would be maintained. They felt any concentration should be downtown, not at Loyola; from the students' point of view concentration at Loyola campus would be suicidal. They did not want to see a concentration wholly at Sir George either but if it had to be one way or the other, they were more comfortable with the weight at Sir George.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale urged Council to vote against the motion and to concern itself only with Arts and Science, and not Engineering students. This was the only time that Arts and Science had an opportunity to discuss these scenarios in this specific form, therefore Council should try to come up with two or three statements which it considered to be best for the placement for Arts and Science in the physical space at this university. She therefore wished to call the question.

Vote: 26 for; 14 against; 1 abstention.

91-10M-6 It was moved and seconded (Nero/Parent) that Arts and Science Faculty support Scenario C from the Final Report of the Strategic Space Planning Committee with the following amendments in the first paragraph:

This scenario would be oriented towards the consolidation of the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science on the Loyola campus, and the Faculty of Commerce and Administration on the Sir George Williams campus, while maintaining significant and viable teaching and administrative presence on the Loyola campus. Performing Arts disciplines would remain on the Loyola campus, with more effective departmental facilities being provided, and Communication Studies, Classics, Journalism, Lonergan College, Modern Languages and Exercise Science would maintain their current status on the campus. A group of humanities or social science departments (excluding Psychology), whose students and research activities would benefit from proximity to such academic units as the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science or the Performing Arts, could be accommodated on the Loyola campus while maintaining a significant and viable teaching and administrative presence on the Sir George Williams campus. The pure

sciences and the remaining humanities and social science departments could be grouped together on the Sir George Williams campus, while maintaining a significant and viable teaching and administrative presence on the Loyola campus, along with the Visual Arts disciplines.

Not Carried: 15 for; 19 against; 6 abstentions.

Dr. Gray requested a procedural move that if a similar motion was to be made on either of the other two scenarios, that it also be held upon the third. In other words, he would not like to see either of the other two scenarios not have expression made upon them. Of course, we could decide to consider neither of the other two scenarios, following Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale's suggestion.

Dr. Bertrand said that Dr. Gray's suggestion was anticipatory and we would deal with events as they happened.

91-10M-7 It was moved and seconded (Decarie/Parent) that Arts and Science Faculty accept Scenario B from the Final Report of the Strategic Space Planning Committee.

Dr. Decarie was in favour of discussing this from the point of view of Arts and Science but noted that at the last Council meeting it had been made clear that the time for the preparation of scenarios had gone. We had the three and we must go with three, if we proposed something new there was no time for an analysis to be made and therefore, by approving something else, we would simply take ourselves out of the picture. He moved acceptance of scenario B as the least objectionable of those left, and thanks to Dr. Gray's motion we had somehow covered ourselves against the damage that might result from it. This was not a ringing cheer but was the best we could come up with.

Dr. Bertrand reminded Council that scenario C was only rejected as changed by Ms. Nero. Therefore scenario C, unchanged could still be endorsed.

91-10M-8 It was moved and seconded (Byers/Beaudoin) that Arts and Science Faculty recommends that whatever space plan the university adopted for restructuring space, that it must reflect the integrated nature of the Arts and Science Faculty.

Dr. Bertrand said that he could not accept Dr. Byers motion as there was a motion already on the floor.

Dr. Byers suggested that perhaps Dr. Decarie would reconsider his motion and

withdraw it from the floor.

Dr. Decarie and Mr. Parent agreed to withdraw their motion 91-10M-7.

Dr. Byers said that Arts and Science wanted a space plan that reflected the integrated nature of the faculty and also a space plan that maintained a viable two-campus operation and that by rejecting A, we could then consider which of the other possibilities we wished to proceed to. He changed the wording of his motion to:

91-10M-9 It was moved and seconded (Byers/Beaudoin) that the Arts and Science Faculty Council rejects Scenario A. The Arts and Science Faculty Council recommends that whatever space plan the university adopts for restructuring space, it must reflect the integrated nature of the Faculty of Arts and Science and maintain a viable two-campus operation for Arts and Science.

Dr. White felt that the second part of the motion was not inconsistent with scenario A in terms of the faculty. Scenario A clearly presented a two-campus operation.

Dr. Byers responded that by rejecting Scenario A and then by stating that whatever space plan was adopted by the university, it should reflect these two principles did not seem to be inconsistent to him. He was thinking that Scenario A had the effect of splitting the sciences from the humanities and that seemed to go to the heart of what we meant by an integrated Arts and Science faculty.

Ms. Halsal said that Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale had suggested voting against Ms. Nero's motion; Ms. Halsal would like to know Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale's suggestions for the future of the Faculty of Arts and Science.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale said that her first suggestion was that we talk about it, and not just about the scenarios. She cautioned that there were traps in these scenarios, the biggest one being C, that if Engineering was moved out to Loyola, it would significantly eclipse the options for Arts and Science. If Council got involved in scenarios, there would be all kinds of limitations, particularly because these were not very well spelled out and were very vague. We needed to ask, if as a Faculty of Arts and Science, it was important to have science and arts together; or to have humanities and social sciences together; or was it important that our departments be located in some proximity to library collections and laboratories. It seemed that these were the concerns that we should be taking positions on. She asked Dr. Giguère if the other faculties just chose a scenario or if they stated their positions in that they preferred this or that location, or in the case of Fine Arts remained neutral. Were they more concerned with taking a more substantive position rather than choosing a particular scenario.

Dr. Giguère said that Engineering claimed to be driven by the academic concerns in consideration of Scenario C', which was in fact, to move the whole faculty to Loyola. However, they wanted that move only when the whole faculty could move at once. They did not like scenario C as it was presented because of the tremendous interaction of the Department of Computer Science with Electrical Engineering and Computer Engineering. The research group in the faculty tended to be inter-departmental. The faculty had to remain in contiguous space - either at Loyola or at Sir George. In the end, they preferred A for reasons of cost; they were quite convinced that scenario C' would cost significantly more than A. The other element was they felt that their student clientele was drawn more from an area that could be better served by being downtown.

Mr. Parent argued that scenario B was not one that should be considered for Arts and Science. Rather, scenario C was the one which dealt more closely with the needs of Arts and Science. A and B ignored Arts and Science.

Dr. Bertrand reminded Mr. Parent that the motion on the floor for discussion concerned scenario A.

Dr. Sellers asked for clarification of the second paragraph. He wondered whether it implied the development of laboratories on one campus and high-quality research at another campus.

Dr. Giguère said that scenario A indicated that if there were a shift in humanities and their location, it meant that many department would have quarters on both campuses. This meant that it would be expected that those departments concentrated primarily at Loyola campus would develop their research facilities at Loyola campus. It was not saying that those departments primarily based on the Sir George Williams campus would be expected to carry out their research at Loyola.

Dr. Chaikelson pointed out that the Faculty of Commerce had said no to B, Engineering had said no to C, and Arts and Science were now saying no to A. This effectively gave the Board of Governors an open hand to choose whichever one they preferred. If they were to do that she would prefer them not to do that in ignorance without having a detailed statement of the kind that Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale had suggested.

Miss Halsal said that she was getting confused. It seemed to her that Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale had said that Council should concern itself only with Arts and Science and not with what Engineering was doing, yet she was inquiring about what they thought.

Dr. Bertrand pointed out that Council was discussing Dr. Byers' motion.

Dr. Pallen asked if we were in a position to reject A, B and C and come up with a new scenario of our own.

Dr. Bertrand said that he did not see why not.

Dr. White asked Dr. Byers to explain the implications of a previous motion which Council had passed on the message that we were sending about scenario A. It seemed to him that the motion that we did pass was that the scenarios were to be interpreted as not designating which departments go where. And once that principle was adopted, it seemed to him that scenario A, from the Arts and Science Faculty point of view simply said that there was a block of space at Loyola for Arts and Science and there was a block of space at Sir George for Arts and Science.

Dr. Byers responded that this resolution was consistent with the previous one. It seemed that unless there was the presence of some strong professional faculty at Loyola in the future, in addition to the presence of Arts and Science, then in fact the section of Arts and Science which was housed at Loyola was at some risk. The nature of the Arts and Science Faculty, as an integrated faculty was at some risk.

Dr. Decarie asked that the question be called.

Vote: 25 for; 5 against; 1 abstention.

- 91-10M-9** It was moved and seconded (Byers/Beaudoin) that the Arts and Science Faculty Council rejects Scenario A. The Arts and Science Faculty Council recommends that whatever plan for restructuring space the university adopts that it must reflect the integrated nature of the Faculty of Arts and Science and maintain a viable two-campus operation for Arts and Science.

Carried: 26 for; 6 against; 4 abstentions.

- 91-10M-10** It was moved and seconded (Segalowitz/Hoecker-Drysdale) that the Arts and Science Faculty Council recommend for serious study, by Senate and the Board of Governors, the proposal to consolidate Fine Arts on the Loyola Campus with the aim of creating a cohesive educational environment for the Creative and Communication Arts and to use the VA building for the consolidation and expansion of the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science.

Mr. Toone objected to this motion arguing that it ran contrary to the idea of

interdisciplinary studies. He also questioned the ability of the VA building to accommodate all of Engineering.

Professor Crysler said that he was against the motion because we were making statements about what other faculties should do, not just Arts and Science. He also added that people link Communications and Fine Arts all the time but he reminded Council that Communications and Journalism used to be in the Humanities when we had those separations and did not like the idea of being isolated with the Faculty of Fine Arts as they had even less in common with them on a day-to-day basis than with the French Department, History Department or the Political Science Department. He believed in a two-campus operation for those that must have a two-campus operation. However, he felt that we were going to be faced with consolidation but that some departments could not afford to be consolidated.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale said the motion was an interesting one because it satisfied one of the points which Dr. Byers had made earlier about his fear of what would happen to a balanced two-campus operation if there were no other faculties at Loyola except a second string of Arts and Science. If Fine Arts were to be consolidated at Loyola, that would give a heavy presence to a particular faculty which did not have to worry about student enrolment because it drew upon a certain student clientele. In addition to that, Commerce had already indicated that they would like a two-campus operation so presumably Commerce would have some presence at Loyola as well then if Engineering stayed downtown there would be a more balance two-campus operation which would never happen if all of the major operations of the faculties were on one campus. The real question that was being dealt with was what to do we do with the west-end campus. It seemed that nobody wanted to be on the west-end campus but there were lots of people, including students, who were not represented here today who would like to be or continue to be on the west-end campus. Arts and Science had more in common with Fine Arts than with Engineering.

Dr. Segalowitz responded that this motion said nothing about what would happen to Arts and Science. Those departments that had affinity with Fine Arts could indeed be accommodated at Loyola, if that was what they wished or be located on both campuses for that matter. This motion simply aimed to create a particular environment out at Loyola campus which had a strong student clientele which would follow it and recommended for serious study the practicality of perhaps using the VA building for Engineering, which he did not believe had been sufficiently explored.

Mr. Ryan said that as Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale pointed out earlier, we were here to discuss what to do about the Arts and Science faculty. Again, the discussion seemed to be about what to do about Fine Arts which was problematic earlier but

was obviously not problematic now. He thought that it was problematic and called the question.

Vote: Carried

- 91-10M-10** It was moved and seconded (Segalowitz/Hoecker-Drysdale) that the Arts and Science Faculty Council recommend for serious study, by Senate and the Board of Governors, the proposal to consolidate Fine Arts on the Loyola Campus with the aim of creating a cohesive educational environment for the Creative and Communication Arts and to use the VA building for the consolidation and expansion of the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science.

Defeated: Vote: 14 for; 19 against; 8 abstentions.

Ms. Nero asked for debate to continue on whether Council wished to support a particular scenario. There had been no statements regarding library collections or consolidation. The Student Caucus was weary of not coming up with something to support and being forced to oppose everything.

Dr. Widden said that this Council had not yet rejected Scenario C.

- 91-10M-11** It was moved and seconded (Widden/Lévy) that Arts and Science Faculty Council endorse Scenario C of the Final Report of the Strategic Space Planning Committee.

Carried: 23 for; 13 opposed; 4 abstentions.

Dr. Gray moved that Council approve scenario B.

Dr. Bertrand said that he could not accept that motion; he could accept a motion giving scenario B second preference. Council had endorsed scenario C, he did not feel we could also endorse scenario B.

Dr. Gray said that the Dean had ruled his procedural motion out of order which would have in effect allowed upholding each of the three, and now, retrospectively, eliminated the same possibility. He wished to know when it could have been done.

Dr. Bertrand said Dr. Gray could have done that just before Dr. Widden made

his motion.

Dr. Bertrand said that any new motion would have to take into consideration motions already approved. We could not ignore what Council had done.

Dr. Gray did not see a conflict in Council having approved scenario C and now approve scenario B.

Dr. Bertrand said he had no problem with that except that preference was given to scenario C. How can you give a message to Senate that you gave preference to two of them. He thought that Council wanted to give a clear message on which of the scenarios they preferred and therefore had adopted as first preference scenario C.

Dr. Knitter said he understood Dr. Gray's point and requested the Chair to take a straw poll of those who would prefer scenario A, scenario B or scenario C.

Dr. Bertrand did not wish to do that, if the preference turned out to be for scenario B, we would have a parliamentary mess.

Dr. Bertrand felt that we had given a clear enough message by directly rejecting one of the scenarios, and that obviously by approving C rather than B, Council had indicated a preference for that scenario.

6. Board of Governors Committee of Search Committee for Senior Administrators

Dr. Byers informed Council that the Board of Governors had struck a committee to look at the way in which all senior administrators in the university were chosen and to evaluate the procedure and recommend changes. He pointed out that it was a process with possibly very profound implications for the structure of this university. This whole issue was considered by the Steering Committee of the Chairs' Caucus which wrote an open letter which was published in the Thursday Report. The whole thing was happening very fast and proceeding in a sort-of closed fashion. Their request to appear before this committee was refused which made them a little nervous hence they brought the matter to Council to ask for support.

91-10M-12 It was moved and seconded (Byers/Sharma) that the Arts and Science Faculty Council is concerned with the academic implications of any changes to the rules and procedures for evaluating Advisory Search Committees. Council recommends that the November 30th deadline for submissions to the

Committee be extended to provide adequate time for proper debate; that the committee operate in an open and democratic manner; that the opportunity for personal input and dialogue be extended to the academic community at large; that the Committee revoke its decision not to accept any personal presentations; and that the Committee consider changing its composition to increase representation from the academic sector. In addition, Council expects to be consulted about any proposed changes to the rules and procedures before such changes are acted upon by the Board of Governors.

Dr. Bertrand clarified that Dr. Byers wanted this motion if passed by Council to be forwarded directly to the Secretary of the Board of Governors.

Dr. Pallen asked if Dr. Byers was against change. Dr. Pallen informed Council that the committee had been set up to evaluate the procedures.

Dr. Byers responded that he was happy to have a committee look at the procedures and although he was not against change, he was concerned about the academic implications of any changes.

Dr. Pallen said that when the committee was set up by the Board of Governors, Dr. Sheinin, suggest at the time that there should be proper consultation amongst the academic community. He personally alerted the Dean and CUFA that this was being set up, not knowing that they were going to make it public. He still agreed with Dr. Byers that there was not sufficient time for consultation and he would support the motion, providing that they were not against the idea of change.

Dr. Byers said that they welcomed constructive changes in these procedures but were very concerned with the speed with which this had happened and the lack of any open dialogue or opportunity to consult and to bring the proposed recommendations to the wider academic community.

Ms. Nero asked if the mover would consider including consultation with the students as well as faculty.

Dr. Byers said that "the academic community" meant students, staff and faculty. If Dr. Pallen was not happy with the wording of the motion, he would be willing to meet with him to revise it.

Dr. Lévy supported Dr. Byer's motion but did not wish the text to be changed after consultation with Dr. Pallen.

Dr. Bertrand said he could allow the text of the motion to be changed once

Council had voted on it.

- 91-10M-12** It was moved and seconded (Byers/Sharma) that the Arts and Science Faculty Council is concerned with the academic implications of any changes to the rules and procedures for evaluating Advisory Search Committees. Council recommends that the November 30th deadline for submissions to the Committee be extended to provide adequate time for proper debate; that the committee operate in an open and democratic manner; that the opportunity for personal input and dialogue be extended to the academic community at large; that the Committee revoke its decision not to accept any personal presentations; and that the Committee consider changing its composition to increase representation from the academic sector. In addition, Council expects to be consulted about any proposed changes to the rules and procedures before such changes are acted upon by the Board of Governors.

Carried.

Dr. Knitter said that as a point of information for Council, Senate's Steering Committee was also making the same recommendation to the Board of Governors.

Dr. Bertrand said he was certain that the committee would change its composition and extend the deadlines.

7. Next Meeting

Dr. Bertrand informed Council that the next meeting of Council would be held on Friday, January 17, 1992.

Dr. Bertrand took the opportunity to wish everyone a happy holiday and a happy new year. He also thanked Council members it being his last meeting as Chair of Council and said that he had enjoyed every minute of working with Council.

Dr. Pallen thanked Dr. Bertrand on behalf of Council and led a round of applause in appreciation.

8. Adjournment

- 91-10M-13** It was moved and seconded (Knitter/Decarie) that the meeting be adjourned at 4:28 p.m.